LABOUR MONTHLY

1s.

EDITOR . R PALME DUTT

The Class Fight in Britain

R.P.D.

The Margate Conference

Harry Pollitt

Intellectuals for Peace

Professor Levy

OCTOBER, 1948

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. XXX. No. 10 **CONTENTS** October, 1948

Page

Notes of the Month: *The Class Fight in Britain* by R. P. D. ... 289

The Margate Conference by HARRY POLLITT 298

Intellectuals for Peace by PROFESSOR HYMAN LEVY ... 303

United Nations and Greece by PAT SLOAN 308

War in South-East Asia by LI-HUANG 312

100 Years Ago—

The New Rhenish Gazette Re-appears 316

Document of the Month—

Manifesto of the Wroclaw Congress 317

Reviews—

The Chinese in Malaya by Victor Purcell: *H. B. Lim* ... 318

Why Nationalise Steel? by G. D. H. Cole: *I. A. S.* ... 319

United Nations by Bernard Moore: *Stanley Evans* ... 320

The German Revolution of 1848 by Roy Pascal: *J. W.* ... 320

QUITE AN ASSET

Our interview over, my business acquaintance asked me casually: "Why do you call yourselves a Magazine of International Labour?" In answering, I read extracts from a few of the letters in that day's post—from home and overseas. Just the "ordinary" kind we get every day and from which we reprint a tiny selection in this column. "You know", he said thoughtfully, "I wouldn't wonder if all that goodwill wasn't quite an asset".

Yes, international goodwill is "quite an asset"—such an asset that nothing becomes impossible in human affairs. Laying down the newspapers with their headlines on war—war against the Malayan peoples, the Greek people, the Chinese people, you open a letter:

"From behind the dollar curtain in appreciation of the good fight you are waging for a people's world twenty of those dollars—and a promise of more to come. We are a Gideon's Army." (R. B., Pennsylvania).

Some ask us searching questions about Britain. An ex-G.I. writes:

"I remember attending meetings of the Labour Party in Reading where spokesmen stressed that they would play a post-war role of bridging the gap between capitalistic United States and communistic Soviet Russia. Are they still talking in the same vein? I recall such statements were very popular then. How are the English taking their new role of being tails to the United States' foreign policy, of being fitted for a new role of American 'Colonials'? You have a wonderful and beautiful country, but I do not relish the idea of visiting it again as a member of an 'allied' army." (E. G., New York)

They have cause to learn fast in "the Land of the Free and the Home of

(*Continued on page iv. of cover*)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Class Fight in Britain

"Trade Unionism has done excellent work in the past, and in it lies the hope of the workers for the future: that is, the Trade Unionism which clearly recognises that today there are only two classes, the producing Working Class and the possessing Master Class. The interests of these two classes are opposed to each other. The Masters have known this for a long time; the Workers are beginning to see it. They are beginning to understand that their only hope lies in themselves, that from the Masters as a class they can expect no help, and that divided they fall, united they stand. That is why the Union was formed."

Constitution of the National Union of General and Municipal Workers.

THE above words are taken from the Preamble to the Rules of the second largest trade union in Britain—a union of which the writer of these Notes has been a humble and faithful member for over a quarter of a century, endeavouring to carry out the principles inculcated in his Rule Book. Similar Declarations are to be found in the Constitutions of many of the great trade unions of this country. These Declarations were not adopted as empty rhetorical flourishes. They embody the hard won experience, bought with sweat and blood, of generations of working class struggle. The principles they express are not yet the last word for working class victory. But they are certainly the first word: the indispensable basis of elementary working class organisation. Bitter experience has taught that these principles alone can maintain the working class movement, and that their violation means defeat and destruction. Whoever violates them, however highly placed, is a wrecker, a disrupter, an enemy working to undermine the foundations of trade unionism. In the light of these plainly recognised principles of trade unionism we shall need to consider the outcome of the Margate Trades Union Congress, whose proceedings are reviewed by Harry Pollitt in this number. We need to examine how the injunctions of their Rule Book have been carried out by the officials and delegates of the National Union of General and Municipal Workers at Margate. We need to examine how these principles, enshrined in the very Constitutions of the labour movement, are being practised by Mr. Deakin, Mr. Tewson, Sir Stafford Cripps and Mr. Bevin. And some very practical conclusions will need to be drawn for the future advance of the struggle to further the cause for which the unions were formed.

Two Platforms

The Margate Trades Union Congress revealed two platforms. It revealed the platforms of the Right and of the Left. The Right stood for the sanctity of profits, the forgoing of wage demands, co-opera-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ation with the master class, war on militant trade unionism, disruption of international unity, and dependence on the American Colossus of Big Business. The Left stood for trade union unity at home and abroad, resistance to the employers' offensive, the fight to win improved wages and living standards at the expense of profits, and the strengthening of trade unionism through the methods of class struggle for which the unions were founded. With curious and characteristic insolence the Right sought to denounce the Left (in the intervals of having to present them with medals as the best union builders) as wreckers of trade unionism. The thief cries "Stop Thief!" But every concrete controversy showed who were the disloyal wreckers and who were the loyal fighters.

Anti-Communist Hysteria

All the hysterical denunciations of Communism by the Right at Margate, like the similar hysterical denunciations by Bevin in the House of Commons the following week, have only revealed the frenzied fury of a bankrupt leadership which knows its own programme has ended in fiasco. The comic exaggeration of their attempts to blame Communism for everything that has gone wrong, to explain world history in terms of a Communist conspiracy, and to denounce the mildest, most timidly progressive resolution as a Communist trap, has not only exhibited to the world the nervous prostration and Americanised infection of this leadership. It has also exposed their panic fear of the rising strength and militancy of the working class opposition, which was able to maintain a solid core of two to three million votes within the Congress, in addition to the close margins within many other delegations, and was still more powerfully showing itself outside in the factories and in industry, in the Dockers' strike, the Austin strike, and the march of the thirty thousand Clyde engineers whose thunders penetrated even the Dreamland of Margate at the very moment when Cripps was preaching class peace. The more the chorus of the millionaire press, Government Ministers and the General Council majority in unison denounce Communism as their central target, the more Communism is revealed as the leadership of the working class fight—in Britain also, no less than in France and Italy, in world trade unionism and in the liberation struggle of the colonial peoples. The centenary of the Communist Manifesto is being appropriately celebrated this year also by its enemies.

On Whose Side?

"Today there are only two classes, the producing Working Class and the possessing Master Class. The interests of these two classes are opposed to each other." What about it, Sir George Chester, with your new wisdom on behalf of the General Council to preach the glorious gospel of the Sanctity of Profits to bewildered trade union delegates in the best approved textbook terminology of the London School of Economics (which, be it noted in passing, the General

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Council has thoughtfully selected as the ideal training ground for future trade union officials):

> Marginal surplus or profit is essential to the conduct of British industry, whether nationalised or in private hands.

In fact, quite "the British way of life". What about it, Sir Stafford Cripps, with your solemn humbug to conceal the colossal profits being made by comparing a mere modest £320 million of distributed dividends of certain selected companies with a wage total of £3,260 million in the entire field of employment—when your own official statistics show that the total of Rent, Interest and Profits after taxation amounted to no less than £2,588 million in 1947 or 36 per cent. of the entire national product, and that represented an increase from 33 per cent. of the entire national product in 1946. £320 million would already represent over £6 a head for every man, woman and child, or £32 for a family of five—not a bad annual nest egg. But £2,588 million is equivalent to £50 for every man, woman and child in the country, or an additional £5 a week for every family of five—representing the surplus from their labour drawn by the owning class, and proclaimed sacred and "unsoakable" by Cripps, Attlee, Deakin and Bevin. To cap the Alice in Wonderland economics of the White Knight Cripps, a real live Henry Dubb was successfully found among the delegates in the shape of a very youthful worker who fervently proclaimed amid applause that they should all work harder and not think about wages—and his photograph duly appeared on the front page of every newspaper the next morning as the true ideal worker dreamed of by every millionaire. "Up with Profits!" "Down with Wages!" What a wonderful, inspiring lead to come from a Trades Union Congress. But, then, why have trade unions? Perhaps by next year the American Gospel will have been more completely mastered, and next year's Congress will be no doubt devoted to the theme of "The Fallacy of Trade Unionism".

"No Saviour From On High Deliver"

"They are beginning to understand that their only hope lies in themselves, that from the Masters as a class they can expect no help." What about it, Miss Florence Hancock, with your solemn presidential pronouncement:

> We are satisfied that economic recovery, no less for our own country than for Europe and the world, depends on our acceptance and intelligent use of the resources which the people and the Government of the United States have offered.

Quite the modern paraphrase. "They are beginning to understand that their only hope lies in the U.S.A., that from the Masters of Wall Street they can expect all help". Unfortunately for the new vision of the Bounty of Mammon to replace the old, antiquated class conceptions, the latest Orders from Washington are taking a nasty turn for the prospects of British recovery. Immediately after Sir Stafford Cripps

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had delivered his eloquent address to the Trades Union Congress to sacrifice everything for the export drive as the only road to recovery, he had to catch the train to meet Mr. Harriman as the Bailiff's Man in possession on behalf of the American Lords Bountiful and receive the latest directives. And the latest directives made his speech to the Trades Union Congress on the export drive look comic:

> It is understood that Mr. Harriman has suggested that a large part of the Western Union defence group's munition manufacturing programme should be carried out in Britain, on the grounds that the British Isles are less likely to be overrun by a Continental Power, and that British industry is less subject than the French to stoppages inspired by the Communists.
>
> *It is realised that, if this were to happen, Britain's export trade, and therefore dollar position, would be seriously affected, and some method would have to be found of making up the lost dollars.* (*The Times*, September 7, 1948).

"We'll compensate you, old man, of course we'll compensate you suitably after knocking you out of business."

Tanks or Tractors

In vain Sir Stafford Cripps could endeavour to claim as a triumph of "recovery" in his report for the first half of 1948 that the deficit on the balance of payments was running at a rate of "only" £280 millions a year (military overseas expenditure suitably concealed from view behind sales of war stores, thus leaving the figure announced for the net deficit completely unreal as a current figure), that the dollar deficit was running at "only" £390 million a year, and that the drain on gold and dollar reserves was running at an annual rate of "only" £508 million. But he had to admit that the latter figure far exceeded any prospects of "aid" under E.R.P.: that the drain of £254 million on the gold and dollar reserves in half a year was

> still a very large figure, and much in excess of the aid we are receiving or are likely to receive under the European Recovery Programme.

In other words, E.R.P. provides no solution. But indeed this is an under-statement. The total revised allocation for Britain, after Hoffman cracked the whip in Paris to scale down Britain and scale up Western Germany, is £312 million. From this must be deducted (1) £70 million for credits to Europe; (2) £50 million for unfreezing sterling balances; (3) 5 per cent., or over £15 million, for American stockpiling of colonial raw materials: a total deduction of £135 million. This leaves £177 million for the net figure, of which one quarter is to be a loan at interest, thus leaving finally the grand total of £133 million for real net "aid"—or only just over one quarter of the present annual drain on gold and dollar reserves. And even this is conditional on fulfilment of the rearmament programme of the Western Bloc, which would completely distort any plans for economic recovery. As the *Economist* (11.9.48) had to recognise:

> Mr. Harriman's suggestion that Britain should turn itself into an arsenal for Western Union is perhaps a hint of the type of reorganisation

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

likely to persuade Congress that the Western European Powers are willing to do more than watch the Superfortresses fly to and fro.

But the dilemma facing the Five Powers is that in their present economic predicament *they cannot both expand their fighting forces and increase their trade and production.* Men, dollars and raw materials are all scarce. *Europe can make enough tanks or enough tractors; it cannot make enough of both.*

In short, the choice is not Recovery *through* the Marshall Plan, as falsely claimed at the Trades Union Congress. The choice is Recovery *or* the Marshall Plan: you can't have both.

No Political Strings?

At the Trades Union Congress the Chairman's Address of Florence Hancock fervently proclaimed that if there were any question of economic or political strings for Marshall "aid" the trade union movement would never have dreamed of accepting it. We have already seen the economic strings, by which the unanimous resolution adopted by the T.U.C. calling on the Government "to take all possible steps to extend and increase reciprocal trading between this country and the U.S.S.R." is hamstrung by the simultaneous acceptance of the Marshall Plan. Now let us look at the political strings. Listen to Mr. Hoffman laying down the law for France, speaking in Paris on September 10:

> He was asked whether aid to France would be cut off if she had a Communist Government. He replied that it certainly would because such a policy had been laid down in the Act. When asked whether the same policy would apply if a totalitarian Government of another colour came in, he said that it was a "highly academic question" . . . He could answer about Communist Governments because the Act specified what would be done. The Act did not say anything about Fascist Governments. His own opinion was that aid should equally be denied to a Fascist Government, but he would not consider a Government headed by General de Gaulle as Fascist. (*The Times*, 11.9.48).

Thus for de Gaulle full aid. For a Communist Government, even though based on an elected parliamentary majority—immediate economic sanctions. This is sufficiently clear political intervention. But of course the green light for reaction and war on Communism is strictly "non-political" in Mr. Deakin's sense, when he complained that the Soviet trade unions were introducing "politics" into the World Federation of Trade Unions because they objected to the Anglo-American right wing demand that the World Federation should be tied to the Marshall Plan and the Anglo-American imperialist bloc.

Unity Under The Ban

"*Divided they fall, united they stand. That is why the Union was formed.*" What heresy from the standpoint of the General Council majority today! Here is the modern version in the mouth of the N.U.G.M.W. official, Tom Williamson, speaking of the left wing trade unionists ("mischief-makers"):

> They must not squeal if the unions see to it that they do get out.

Twenty-one years ago the same language was heard from a right wing

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leader at a Trades Union Congress which is still remembered with shame—the Swansea Congress that met under the banner of Mondism, just as this Margate Congress met under the banner of Marshall:

> If the Communists don't like our system and method, let them get out of it. They are better out of the movement than in it.

But it was not the Communists that became company directors and passed out of the movement. It was not the Communists that joined the Tories and stabbed the movement in the back. It was the right wing Communist-eaters. Today the Communists, after all the threats and provocations, are more strongly established than ever in the support and confidence of millions of trade unionists by the record of their work and loyalty and the justification of the policies for which they have fought. But the offensive of the Right Wing is not merely directed against the Left in Britain because they are still a minority. It is equally directed against world trade unionism, because on the world scale the Left is in the majority. In either case the principle of the Right is the same: If you can't get your own way, disrupt unity.

For World Trade Union Unity

So the offensive is turned, under American direction, against the World Federation of Trade Unionism—the greatest organisational achievement of the post-war working class, the greatest achievement of all trade union history, uniting for the first time eighty million trade unionists without distinction of nation, race or colour. The organisation is attacked and denounced by the very man who holds the responsibility as Chairman to work for it because the Anglo-American bloc find themselves a minority within it. Mr. Deakin complained that the Anglo-Americans only controlled three out of eight votes on the Executive. He did not venture to deny that this was considerably more than their proportionate strength. He did not venture to deny that the majority on the Executive represented the majority in the world trade union movement. Such elementary considerations of democracy were foreign to him. There are eight million British trade unionists among eighty million trade unionists of the world. Why should one tenth dictate to the remainder? Why should one tenth lay down the law and demand the right to choose the delegate from the world organisation and refuse to permit the Secretary of the World Federation, to which they are affiliated, to attend their Congress? But this is the curious conception of democracy of the Right Wing. Democracy is well enough, so long as you have a safe majority bloc vote in your pocket. But if you are in a minority, to hell with democracy. Why should we, the glorious sons of Empire, allow a pack of colonial trade unionists to count as our equals? Let us rather make a snug imperialist labour "international" again based on fragments of Western Europe and America. So was delivered the assault which remains the blackest blot on the record of the Margate Trades Union Congress—the rejection of the resolution to "reaffirm support

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the W.F.T.U. and resist attempts to destroy unity inside that body". Well might the Tory *Daily Telegraph* comment:

> It was an odd sight to see British trade unionists, hitherto always in the van of international co-operation and the most internationally minded of any national trade union group, administering what may prove to be the death-blow to their own child.

The most intensive fight will need to be waged to defeat this assassin's blow against the foundations of international working class solidarity.

Time To Awaken

The most urgent practical conclusions need to be drawn from the outcome of the Margate Trades Union Congress for the future of the working class fight. Twice before in the past thirty years the siren song of class co-operation and increased production as the supposed path to prosperity has been preached for British trade unionism. The first time was after the first world war, when the Clynes propaganda of the "Gate to More" was plastered on the hoardings. The outcome was the post-war crisis, as soon as the replacement boom was over, which broke out in the winter of 1920 and led to chronic mass unemployment in this country which never ceased until the second world war (those who bless the Labour Government for "full employment" should open their eyes to reality and bless the war—there is no more security of "full employment" in the capitalist conditions of this country than in America). The second time was the poison draught of Mondism and rationalisation two decades ago; then also the American miracle and Fordism was the idol of the hour; then also the Trades Union Congress denounced the Left and worshipped at the shrine of the American Mammon. The outcome was the world economic crisis and the hell of the thirties. We do not want to drink of this poisoned cup a third time. It is time to awake to the fight which stands before British trade unionism.

"Recovery" Moonshine

It is time to awaken from the chloroform fumes of the "recovery" propaganda which is being peddled by Government Ministers and the capitalist press. "Recovery" for whom? "Recovery" for what? Production has been increased by the efforts of the workers, until it is now claimed to be 24 per cent. above the level of 1946, which is stated to have equalled pre-war. Have the workers benefited? The conditions of the workers have grown worse. Real wages have gone down. But profits have soared to record heights, with an increase of £631 millions or 22 per cent. between 1945 and 1947. This is the "recovery". A fine "recovery", where the rich grow richer and the poor power. Exports targets have been attained. For what aims? To pay for increased consumption imports? Or to pay for overseas military expenditure and colonial wars and Berlin air-lifts and the foreign policy of Mr. Bevin? New export targets are proclaimed. But already the world market is tightening. The easy sellers' market is coming to an end. American capitalism, fearful of crisis, is multiplying its

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

export drive and using all its superiority of equipment and its Marshall hold to drive Britain out of market after market. In the home market the fall of purchasing power is revealing itself. The conditions for crisis are maturing. As the difficulties increase, the drive to cut costs of production for export is intensified. And that drive means the new offensive on the wages, standards, conditions and hours of the workers. Cripps said to the Trade Union Congress:

> I would rather see the introduction of new methods and new machinery than longer hours of work.

But he pointed out at the same time that there were no resources for the necessary re-equipment of machinery. And the National Union of Manufacturers, welcoming Cripps's statement, drew the moral:

> The movement towards shorter working hours should be halted, and indeed in some cases reversed.

There, in the preparation of the new intensified employers' offensive against the workers' standards and conditions, lies the true significance of the right wing policy at the Margate Trades Union Congress, behind all the anti-Communist fanfares which were only the cover.

Rearmament Versus Recovery

The comment of reality on the right wing decisions of Margate was the Government's announcement of its new military programme in the following week, for extended service and increased armaments production and expenditure. The Government's new military programme and the Margate Congress decisions are counterparts of a single policy. It is for this that the workers are called on to sacrifice and go short. The new military programme knocks to pieces the official estimates of the economic perspective. It means the draining of man-power from production. It means the draining of resources from productive uses. The slowing up of demobilisation is only the beginning, the preparation for the extension of military service next year. Housing may be held up, but the production of fighter aircraft is to be doubled. With the resources that might have meant houses for the workers in Britain, the Beaufighters are to be turned out to bomb the huts of Malayan peasants and render them homeless. There is no concealment of the purposes of the new military programme. The new military programme is dictated by the requirements of colonial war and a reactionary international policy.

> The Government has to take into account the troubles in Burma, Malaya, India and Palestine. The ordering of the second Guards Brigade to Malaya has substantially affected our strategic reserve. . . .
>
> Russia is not believed to be bent on war. But the Government's plans are by no means entirely dependent on the Moscow negotiations, nor are they due solely to Russian policy. We have to take a wider view, and in the East there are actual hostilities and a risk of their extension.
>
> The battalions of Guards and armoured troops now on their way to Malaya represented the bulk of our last and only mobile strategic reserve. (*Sunday Times*, 29/8/48).

And again

> If Britain is to fulfil its commitments in Malaya, the Middle East and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> elsewhere, it is essential that the period of service is increased by at least six months. Some Service chiefs . . . would even like to see it increased from one to two years. (*Evening Standard*, 1/9/48).

The aims of colonial war, of imperialist policy are open. Talk of the "Russian danger" is only a blind for reactionary aggressive imperialism. It is for this that the workers are asked to make more sacrifices and increase production, to forgo wage claims and suffer shortage—for the honour of bombing Malayan peasants, executing the heroes of anti-Japanese resistance, shooting down African strikers and demonstrators, and sabotaging international working class solidarity.

Two Offensives

In the class struggle there are only two sides. In the class struggle the alternatives are to fight or go under, to deal the blow that strikes at the enemy or by the loss of opportunity to become the object of attack. The moment of opportunity is still in the hands of the workers; but the offensive of the employers, in conjunction with the Government, against the standards of the workers has already begun. By the policy of price increases, cutting down of subsidies and the wage freeze, the offensive has in fact begun; but this beginning is only a first stage of the full offensive which is inexorably preparing from the present economic situation and the policy of the Government. It is not enough to warn against and prepare for this offensive whose threatening shadows already loom large. The best defence is attack. The urgent need is to press forward the workers' offensive now, while the conditions of relatively full employment are still favourable, in the fight for wage increases and improved standards, against high prices and high profits, and for the reversal of the present disastrous reactionary policy of the Government. The Margate Congress decisions failed to give the leadership for this fight. But the strength, solidarity and tenacious battle of the millions-strong opposition represented at the Congress, no less than the developments outside the walls of the conference chamber, have shown the gathering of the forces for the fight in front. And the proceedings of the Congress, no less than the developments outside, have shown also the role which Communism is playing and will play in the leadership of this new advance of the working class fight in Britain.

September 18, 1948. R. P. D.

The Editor of LABOUR MONTHLY *will be very glad to receive contributions in the form of finished articles or of suggestions and data for articles. The customary proviso must be made that no responsibility is undertaken for manuscripts sent to him nor can he promise to enter into any correspondence regarding contributions not accepted.*

The articles in LABOUR MONTHLY *are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.*

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *United Kingdom,* 12 *months* 12*s. Postage paid. Abroad,* 13*s. from* LABOUR MONTHLY, 134 *Ballards Lane, London, N.*3, **or** *from all leading wholesalers and bookshops.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MARGATE CONFERENCE

By HARRY POLLITT

THE 80th Trades Union Congress at Margate represented an all-out mobilisation of the right wing trade union leaders in support of policies at home and abroad to strengthen capitalism by a new offensive against the conditions of the working class and repel the new international friendships which alone could assist both in solving Britain's economic difficulties, and in strengthening the cause of peace and the advance to socialism. To secure success for such a policy they had organised their attacks on Communism on every conceivable occasion. From the Chairman's opening address to the closing remarks, the one dominant aim of the right wing was to create prejudice by trying to denounce every progressive idea, speech or resolution as being Communist. It was so repetitive and extravagant that it became nauseating; but it must be admitted that in its immediate purpose, the right wing succeeded and has managed to get decisions which assist the Government and the employers in their offensive against the workers' standards.

The capitalist class and its Labour Government will know how to make the fullest use of the Margate decisions. There was not one word of criticism against either the employers or the capitalist system by any of the leading Trade Union officials who dominate the General Council of the T.U.C. The capitalist press, of course, will declare that the Margate T.U.C. represents "a defeat for the Communists", but the unconcealed fury of the attacks against the Communists is the expression of the fear of Communist influence in the factories and trade unions.

The Margate Congress was held at a time when the economic crisis in Britain is rapidly deepening; when increasingly the workers are expressing discontent over their wage rates and higher cost of living, as typified in the demonstration of 30,000 Glasgow engineers and shipbuilders who were marching when Miss Hancock, the President of the T.U.C., was attacking the Communists for defending the living standards of the workers. There is a widespread frustration in all the nationalised industries over the present composition of the Boards, and as was frequently admitted at the Congress itself, widespread cynicism and distrust of the entire "Produce More" campaign. The grip of the U.S.A. on Britain's economy is tightening and a barbarous colonial war is being waged in Malaya; while Cripps bemoans the fact that there is no new manpower to draw upon, thousands of British young men are sent to murder colonial peoples fighting for their independence.

The decisions of the Margate Conference have undoubtedly given great joy both to Wall Street and Fleet Street, but they will bring increased misery and poverty—unless they are effectively challenged—to millions of British working people. The Margate

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

decisions are in violent contrast to the real feelings and policy demands of the Trade Unionists as expressed in the resolutions which many of their Trade Unions had sent to the Congress agenda, particularly in relation to wages, prices and profits, but the right wing trade union leaders had their own ideas about what the Congress should decide. For them it was not meant to represent a unifying of the workers' struggle to defend and improve their conditions, or for the sharpening of the class struggle against capitalism. Their carefully prepared aim was that the Congress should take the form of a demonstration against the "Reds", against Communism, and against international working class solidarity.

It is true that Cripps was listened to with very serious attention as he gave his explanation of the economic position, but it was also noted that his speech represents perhaps the most outstanding example of class collaboration that has been advocated and practised since the Swansea T.U.C. of 1928, and not a few delegates recalled to mind the disastrous consequences that followed as a result of the adoption of the Mond-Turner policy in that year. What, however, was really laughable (if its consequences could not be so tragic) was the attempt of Cripps to defend the profits of the capitalists on the one hand and drag out the old story of the size of the cake on the other. The " size of the cake " and " You can't get more out of a pint pot than there is in it " were always the pet theories of J. H. Thomas, and everybody knows where he landed. They were exposed at a thousand street corners in the 1880s and '90s when the socialist movement was just developing in this country. Even so, the Cripps policy, while receiving the acclamation of the capitalists, didn't go far enough for them. The National Union of Manufacturers immediately issued a press statement welcoming the speech, but demanding longer hours. *The Times* carried a leader in which it chastised Cripps, ever so gently, of course, for not demanding fewer absentees and fewer restrictive Trade Union practices. The Financial Correspondent of *The Times,* commenting in his City Notes on Cripps' speech, declared:

> The financial world will at least be relieved to find that both the general loyalty to the policy of dividend limitation and the small share of revenue taken by distributed profits have been honourably recognised . . . Sir Stafford's review of the factors affecting productivity was impressive and his address should certainly help to keep the Congress in realistic mood. So far, at any rate, the prospects for his policy, including the limitation of wage and profit increases, have improved. (8/9/48).

The Congress, however, was never given a real analysis of the actual economic situation, particularly in relation to the perspective. The General Council stated in its "analysis" of the economic situation:

> Undoubtedly the policy recommended by the General Council involves great difficulties. The country has not yet reached the stage of convalescence. It is still in the stage of remedial treatment—at times painful—but the struggle is for survival and the treatment will become less severe as greater stability is attained.

It is necessary to put this question: If Britain is in an economic

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

crisis at a time of full employment when the sellers' market is not yet completely dried up, when Germany and Japan are not yet in a position to offer any serious competition, and even in this situation wages are to be frozen (prices and profits are allowed to rise), what will be the position of the working class when overtaken by an economic slump—for which the U.S.A. and Britain are now heading? The General Council's analysis of the economic position was a criminal deception of the movement. While goods are piling up in the shops because real wages are going down, and the export trade is already running into difficulties, and military expenditure is soaring, an economic slump, not full employment, is what the future holds in store.

The right wing leaders in the Government, Labour Party and the T.U.C. are already preparing to reduce the standards of the working class still further. All the arguments to justify wage freezing when there is not yet a slump will be reinforced one-hundred-fold to impose heavy wage reductions and longer hours in order to under-cut our foreign competitors when the cut-throat competition over exports increases, as it will.

The debate on production from the right wing point of view was a complete fiasco. It was only the "Reds" who endeavoured to present the production issue in its right way. These leaders will yet have to recognise that the fundamental reason why there is no enthusiasm or conviction for production is that the Government's general policy is that of aggressive monopoly capitalism, with higher production meaning increased profits for the boss and lower real wages for the workers. When one contrasts the fulfilment of all the economic plans up to date in the Soviet Union and the new democracies, the enthusiastic and voluntary co-operation in every aspect of these plans by the masses, with the daily exhortations to the British working class to work harder, etc., the contrast between social systems that are fundamentally different from each other is at once clear—in the case of the Soviet Union and the new democracies for the building up or strengthening of socialist forms of economy, and in Britain for the strengthening of capitalism. For that latter purpose and aim, the British working class will never give of its best.

In a leading article, discussing the Trades Union Congress agenda in reference to Nationalisation Boards, *The Times* had contemptuously stated:

> It is remarkable that the Labour Movement, in undisputed power, has been content to accept a form of nationalisation which gives men from the ranks quite a minor place in the control. Many leaders from the past would rub their eyes if they could see it. (6/9/48).

The Congress, however, did take an important decision on the question of more workers' representatives on the Nationalisation Boards, and the temper and spirit evinced in this debate will have to be noted by the Government. The main thing in connection with the Congress decision on the Nationalisation Boards, is not to let it remain a paper document, but to follow it up by an immediate campaign for

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED
PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG

Indeed, the attention paid to the magnificent speech of Wally Stevens, General Secretary of the Electrical Trades Union, in moving the resolution against wage freezing, was in marked contrast to the inattention to the ponderous platitudes and generalisations of Tewson in defending the General Council's policy. Stevens neatly punctured Cripps' defence of profits when he produced figures to prove (and they were never challenged) that if one quarter of all the profits now being made were available for increased wages, then they could go up by 2/7 in the £1. This resolution received 2,184,000 votes against 5,207,000. But these figures do not give a complete picture of the opposition to wage-freezing. For whilst the miners voted for wage freezing at the same time as they are asking for a wage increase, their decision to do so was only taken after a vote in their delegation which was 44 to 42. In other delegations the voting was very close. In the two million vote are represented the principal craft Trade Unions in Britain and the Civil Service unions; and neither the employers, the Government, nor the General Council will have any illusions about the serious significance of this vote, as the coming great mass movements for wage increases will prove.

Time here will also bring about great changes. The " victory " for the right wing will be short-lived, but its consequences can be disastrous the longer it is allowed to continue. I only hope that all progressive delegates to Margate will go out of their way to give the most exhaustive report of the proceedings to the workers in the factories, in the local and District Trade Union organisations. In this way, alongside the developing mass movement which I am confident is going to manifest itself, we shall see who are the real defenders of the interests of the working class—and it will be found to be the Communists and not those who have betrayed every principle which the Trade Union Movement was built up to defend.

There is now urgent need for every Trade Unionist to understand not only the significance of the reactionary decisions adopted at Margate, but to intensify the fight against them. Wage demands to meet the rise in the cost of living should be pressed to the limit. Alongside this should go the demand for the strictest control of prices, drastic reduction in profits and all forms of indirect taxation and especially the abolition of the Purchase Tax on goods necessary for the working class. The strongest resistance should be organised against paying these increased taxes. There should be resistance to all increases in rent. The strongest opposition should be organised also against the proposal to slow down demobilisation, and for a reduction in the armed forces, to bring the troops home from Greece and Malaya, and an all-round reduction in all overseas military expenditure. New pressure should be exerted to compel the Government to open up new trade and political negotiations with the Soviet Union and new democracies so that Britain shall not be dependent on the U.S.A.

ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED
PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG

the reorganisation of every existing Board so that they at once fit in with the policy decided upon by the Margate T.U.C. on this issue of more working class representatives on the Boards.

The debate on the World Federation of Trade Unions was the most sordid in the history of the British T.U.C. It will be one that—
—unless the existing policy is changed—the British Trade Union Movement will have very deep cause to regret. All the bawling, shouting, misrepresentation and slander of Deakin and Lawther did nothing towards the solution of Britain's economic crisis; and tied as we are to the U.S.A., when the economic crash comes in that country to intensify Britain's own economic slump, there is no capitalist nation in the world that will be hit harder than Britain and no working class in the world that will require more international assistance than the British working class. It is very easy to sum up this question of the W.F.T.U. The British T.U.C. had carefully prepared to obtain a mandate at Margate to proceed with their long-cherished plan to destroy the World Federation of Trade Unions and set up a bastard international confined to the U.S.A. and countries connected with the Marshall Plan. They made the unheard-of demand that they should have the right to decide who the fraternal delegate from the W.F.T.U. should be. The essence of Deakin's hysteria is that in the W.F.T.U. the British seem to be in a minority. I wonder what would have happened if the W.F.T.U. had named the delegates that they insisted should be sent from Britain to attend the next Congress of the W.F.T.U. I wonder what Deakin and his friends would have said (if apoplexy had not seized them at such a thought) if they were in a majority and at a Russian T.U.C. the same type of speech was made there as Deakin made at Margate! It is a sorry business. It leaves a nasty taste in the mouth, and those who support this policy, I repeat, will have serious caused to regret it.

The immediate sequel to this debate must also be placed on record. The Transport and General Workers' Union had a resolution down on Greece which Mr. Deakin had to move. He was not in the hall when this resolution was called and there was grave danger that it would go by default, until a coal trimmer from Newport, suffering acutely from a chest disease caused by his employment, a member of the T. & G.W.U., managed to stagger to the tribune, where he was obviously exhausted, but gasped out that he wanted to move this resolution for the T. & G.W.U. That incident was a damning condemnation of Deakin's internationalism.

All the ceaseless barrage against the Communists could not hide the anxiety of the delegates about the seriousness of the wages issue. Every day in one form or another this vital issue was referred to, and all the attempts to sidetrack it by bringing Cripps down and by talk about making " the pound buy a pound's worth of goods " failed. It was the main issue of the Congress, as was proved by the serious character of the debate and the marked attention paid to all the speakers opposing the General Council's policy of wage freezing.

Protests should pour into the General Council against its policy of destroying the World Federation of Trade Unions.

Let the workers in the factories and Trade Unions now fight every inch of the way against reactionary policies that will lead to increased poverty, unemployment and war. What was done at Margate can and must be undone by the mass struggles of the working class against the capitalists and their main support, the right wing Labour leaders. There is one very important point to remember when comparing the Labour Party Conference at Scarborough with the Trades Union Congress at Margate. There was no effective opposition at Scarborough, but there was a splendid fighting opposition at Margate which is going to make its effects felt throughout the factories and Trade Unions. We are quite confident that in the shipyards, engineering factories, steel mills and coalmines the workers will not have allowed to pass unnoticed the fact that it was the "Reds" who spoke up against wage freezing and for higher wages, who fought for more effective working class control of Nationalisation Boards, who fought for the nationalisation of steel, who exposed the dangers of the Marshall Plan for the British people, who brought out such striking facts in relation to the urgency of the housing situation, who championed the cause of the heroic peoples of Greece, Spain and Malaya, and who fought for international working class unity. Every Communist can be proud of the fight our comrades made at Margate, and there will be many others who will share that pride.

When the tumult and shouting has died down and quiet discussions take place on the jobs and in the Trade Union branches, it will be these things which will be remembered and discussed; when the hysterical diatribes of the Deakins, Lawthers, Bowmans and Hancocks have been forgotten, and it will be remembered that the "Reds" fought for the interests of the workers.

INTELLECTUALS FOR PEACE

By PROFESSOR HYMAN LEVY

PEACE is indivisible; war is total. We either deny that the resort to arms can solve the problems of the world, or we assert that we will total war. But the struggle for peace is also total; is waged on all fronts. One sector, not the least important, is held by so-called cultural workers whose appeal is to the emotions and to the intellect—writers, artists, musicians, scientists. They also, in their own way, make the munitions of war as they make the munitions of peace. In a world that has been kept for years on the tenterhooks of war, the co-operation of all men and women of goodwill in these fields is of the greatest significance for the preservation of peace.

No government can wage a modern war with the devastating power of modern weapons, without the moral and active support of the common people. No group therefore can prepare for war without

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the careful planned indoctrination of the minds of us all, if we are to believe that the only way out of our present confusions is by mutual self-slaughter. The enemy must be clearly indicated even if, in the early stages, he is not explicitly mentioned by name. He must be stubborn, brutal, and unreasoning, and it must be obvious that our patience and understanding is tried to its utmost. He must be at once stupid and cunning, grasping and unscrupulous, impervious to decency, devoid of the moral qualities we ourselves clearly possess. A hero in the past, he must be a bully in the present. He must threaten freedom of thought and conscience. If he retorts that we ourselves do the very things of which we accuse him, that merely proves how limited is his understanding and how deceitful his methods. His ways of thought must be different from ours, his culture of a lower order. We are civilisation and he it is that threatens it. If along his frontiers we establish air and naval bases, and sites for the projection of radio-controlled missiles these are merely commonsense acts of self-defence. They threaten no one who is peace loving, for it would be madness to suggest that we, with all our abhorrence of war, should really desire such a catastrophe. But we must be prepared for all eventualities, however remote. To meet the qualms of ordinary decent people therefore, the focus of hostilities must be located as far as possible from one's own territory. It is better that American Super-fortresses should carry out their preparatory manœuvres over Britain than that the American people should be prematurely nerve-racked. It is easier to contemplate foreigners blown to dust by atom bombs, even if these foreigners are British. After all in return are we not to have concrete evidence of American generosity through Marshall aid, even if the sudden cessation of Lease-Lend at the end of the war was a knock-out blow when we were on our knees? That was business, but this is kindness, generosity, goodwill. By careful planning and the planting of bases, therefore, it can be arranged that the U.S.A. shall be much further from the U.S.S.R., than the U.S.S.R. is from the U.S.A.

All this is commonplace of preliminary strategy, but it has to be seen for the cold calculation it is, to be believed.

It is not to be supposed that the American people themselves are party to this. Equally they are victims of the whole set-up. They are in fact the first victims just as the German people ranked early in the Nazi list. Conditioned to the American way of life, accustomed from the cradle to regard the dollar as the absolute measure of all things temporal and spiritual, they imagine we cannot really be in earnest when we fulminate against the spate of American films and cheap sensational novels that has swept over Europe. There is an American way of life that is an integral part of European culture at its best; but there is also something else more insidious that reflects the cheap tawdry values of dollar imperialism, and it is this that functions as the poisoned dart. They must not be confused.

The exposure of all this, and especially the way in which the traffickers of war use it for their own ends, is a task for writers and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

analysts alike, but it is a task that is not easy to perform. We have just witnessed a war in which the most barbarian acts in the history of man were carried through by drilled and organised men and women, without a qualm, because in their eyes these acts seemed justified not only to the consciences of the perpetrators but to the great mass of the 80 million people who stood behind them. Hitler and his gang had at least demonstrated to mankind how to condition the minds of men to a given end. He had shown how values and judgments may be warped, distorted, and even eliminated, how music, literature, and science might be harnessed with deadly effect to his purpose. In the sequel he and his backers have left behind them a heritage of mental and emotional disorder that it would take years of less drastic social conditioning to transform. What may happen if to this a new wave of corresponding nature is allowed to sweep the world unchecked we can only guess. It is the task of cultural workers to read the lessons of the past and to discern the trends in the present. Failing this or failing the courage to speak out, slowly but surely their own judgments will become twisted and distorted until good becomes evil and black white. But for clarity in vision they have to see further. They have to recognise the social and historical purpose this spate of decadence is consciously or unconsciously intended to fulfil. They have to see it as an integral part of the ideology of a rampant imperialism that on the economic side threatens to engulf the whole of the non-Socialist part of the globe.

With these thoughts in our minds we can appreciate how significant was the decision of the French and Polish committees to call a Cultural World Congress for Peace, in order to assess the dangers inherent in the present world situation and to throw up into sharp relief the source from which these dangers spring. It was significant that delegations could come from forty-five different countries comprising in all nearly five hundred people and including the most outstanding names in the world of science and culture. That the delegations were not handpicked in spite of insinuations to the contrary in the press is clear enough from the fact that of the 42 individuals who comprised the British delegation the vast majority had no connection whatsoever with the left movement. The same was certainly true of the American delegation, a large section of which attended because it happened to be in Europe at the moment when the congress was held.

One of the characteristics of a science that distinguishes it sharply from all other activities is that its findings carry unanimous conviction among all who recognise its methodology. This distinction came out sharply at the Congress. Those from the more Marxist countries spoke with an integrated voice, stating and restating their theses and underlining their lessons. This is called dictation from Moscow. From the capitalist countries came a babel of voices, a confusion of argument and a lack of analysis that is called freedom of thought and expression; no science of social change, no analysis of the causes of war, no

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appreciation of the relation of social forces to ideology. The distinction was not between East and West but between Marxist and non-Marxist.

It was by the accident of hospitality that the Congress was held in Wroclaw. It might equally well have been held anywhere. But the fact that it was located in one of the most devastated regions of Europe contained a lesson for those who had eyes to read. I have seen the City of London in flames, and have waded ankle-deep through its streets of broken glass and rubble as the Nazi bombers droned overhead and dropped their loads; I have seen buildings crumple in ruins before my eyes; but it required infinitely greater courage to look Warsaw in the face in peace time. To a Britisher the miles and miles of indescribable devastation, the endless desolate wastes of what were once historic buildings, the creative labour of generations of human beings, was a picture that can never be effaced. Wroclaw was terrible enough, for here the Nazi garrison held out tenaciously, but Warsaw was incredible. Stupefied, I wandered across the flattened wastes of the Ghetto that had once pulsated with the life of a people steeped in ancient lore, with its schools and its religious seminars, its Yiddish artists, painters, poets and writers. Over a million souls driven from the four corners of Poland were here herded to suffocation in the cellars and alley-ways of a walled-in sector of the city. Now it was a vast graveyard beneath which rotted the bodies of men, women and children done to death in the most bestial fashion, reduced in the final stage to the muteness of dumb animals led to the slaughter. Here the last heroic thirty thousand threw themselves, almost unarmed, on their oppressors before they perished in the blazing inferno. Here young children were broken and brained before the eyes of their parents, here human beings sank in succession to lower and lower levels, until, with formless animal cries, men murdered each other for a crust of bread. This is the outcome of modern reactionary war. It is on the verge of this that men and women tremble today. It is back into this that those who contemplate war would press us again.

And this was the background against which the Congress of Wroclaw was held. In the past I had smiled when Soviet writers had used words like fascist beasts, hyenas, jackals, to describe the perpetrators of these deeds. I did not smile now. Instead I began to have a real glimmering of the terrible crime that had been committed on humanity, and how little we appreciated the emotional content of the attitude of the Soviet representatives on international bodies. Precisely the same situation emerged at the Wroclaw Congress. Fadayev's speech, the first full-length discourse on the factors that were leading to war, gave a correct Marxist analysis. Uncompromising, both in matter and manner as it was, to British and American ears it sounded harsh and even crude. No one was more surprised than Fadayev himself. Small nuclei, inside the British and the American delegations, were not slow to seize on this, as an excuse to stage a walk-out, undoubtedly with the assistance of elements from outside. The manœuvres that lay behind this are a tale of intrigue that is a story in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

itself. It suffices to say that in their clumsiness these gentlemen overreached themselves, and so exposed their whole motivation to the few honest supporters they had, for the time being, rallied to themselves. The result was to re-unite the delegation to such an extent that when the final resolution from the conference was put, 35 of the British delegation of 42 personally signed the document. Of the remaining seven, several could not sign for personal reasons unconnected with the content of the resolution. Of the high spots in the Conference, mention must especially be made of the brilliant analysis by Ilya Ehrenburg of the nature and unity of European culture, in reply to those who would seek to drive a wedge between East and West. Another was the simple and direct exposure, by the Colonial delegation, of the oppression of the coloured peoples. This blew sky-high the trite clichés of speakers like Taylor, of Oxford, who with all the assumed ferocity of one who dares to speak his mind behind the iron curtain, insisted that whether he stood within the cloistered seclusion of an Oxford College or amidst the devastated regions of Eastern Europe, he would declaim the need for intellectual honesty and freedom of thought. If Britishers and Americans had listened in shocked surprise to Fadayev, coming as the Americans did from a country untouched, indeed strengthened by the war, delegations who had travelled hundreds of miles through devastated towns and villages, knowing that the greatest and most urgent need of all of them was to be secure from the ravages of war while they attempted to rebuild the shattered homes of their people, listened in surprise to this echo of remote thoughts from a world-famous centre of British learning. There were some who felt that it was fit and proper that Taylor should speak in this way. I, who stood down that Taylor might speak, blushed for its incongruity.

To the delegations themselves the Congress was an epoch making event, a great personal experience. Its significance lay in the fact that for the first time a world conference outstanding in science, art, literature, painting, sculpture, music, found common ground in the unity of their creative work and their cultural heritage, and realised that the danger that threatened it and divided the masses everywhere was merely the intrigue of interested groups that did not scruple for their own ends to lead the world back to barbarism. These intriguers exposed themselves even during the course of Congress. It remains for those who were privileged to be present to carry the message into the minds and hearts of people everywhere lest we be caught unawares. Another such catastrophe will tear to sheds the whole fabric of civilisation.

Articles on the struggle for peace in the second half of 1948 *include*:

"Behind The Dollar Curtain," by American readers (July).
"Design For Peace," by Leah Manning, M.P. (July).
"The War Danger," by William Rust (July).
"End The Cold War," by Henry Wallace (August).
"Germany—The Storm Centre," by J. Winternitz (August).
"Debunking the Excuse for War," by K. Zilliacus, M.P. (August).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

UNITED NATIONS AND GREECE

By PAT SLOAN

ON the agenda of this autumn's United Nations Assembly there is a big variety of items. The list of items is growing. Less than a fortnight before the Assembly was due to meet on 21st September in Paris (and only two days after the Soviet Government had asked for a meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers) *The Times* was assuming failure to agree and saying (10/9/48) " Short of a miracle the Assembly of the United Nations will add the Italian colonies to its agenda."

Of all the items on the Agenda there is one which can be a touchstone for the sincerity of member states in their attitude to the Charter of the United Nations. For this year the question of Greece is once again before the Assembly.

It is common knowledge that in October, 1944, the British troops were welcomed to Greece with flowers, even though they brought with them a government whose unpopular premier was the direct appointee of Churchill in London: two months later Churchill sent British troops into action against the Greek Resistance. It is common knowledge that the Labour Government did not depart from Churchill's policy, but kept British troops in Greece and openly interfered in Greek affairs. Hector McNeil was responsible for appointing Sofoulis premier in November, 1945: and in March, 1946, Ernest Bevin ordered that elections be held in Greece despite Sofoulis's own protest that the terror imposed by the Right made fair elections impossible. Then, six months later, Bevin permitted a rigged plebiscite on the return of the fascist king, despite his solemn promise before the election that no plebiscite would be held for two years.

This sequence of flagrant acts of intervention was consistently opposed by the U.S.S.R. In 1945, at Yalta, and at Potsdam, Stalin protested, but, in the interests of Allied unity, privately. By January, 1946, the situation had become so serious that the U.S.S.R. placed Greece on the agenda of the Security Council, calling for the total withdrawal of British troops. The then Greek Foreign Minister, Sofianopoulous, resigned rather than oppose the Soviet case. His successor, Rentis, could not leave Athens to attend the Security Council for several days, owing to difficulties with the police due to the writs outstanding against him for collaboration with the enemy.

Against this background the Security Council had its first discussion on Greece. The debate was mainly a duel between a well-documented Vyshinsky and a table-thumping Bevin calling for a " clean bill". The Soviet veto alone saved the Security Council from absolving British policy, and the debate ended with a statement from the chair that the views of both sides had been noted.

There followed the Greek election of March, 1946. The whole

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Left and Left Centre abstained in protest against the terror. It was a walkover for the Right and the plebiscite was announced for August. The new monarchist government suppressed the trade unions, legalised mass deportations without trial, and started the orgy of executions which has gone on to this day.

As the situation visibly deteriorated Greece was again placed on the Security Council's agenda, this time by the Ukraine. Now both the U.S.A. and Australia rallied behind Bevin and a U.S. resolution which would have sent a commission to enquire into frontier incidents while ignoring the basic cause of the trouble—British intervention and the resulting fascist régime—was prevented only by the Soviet veto.

Up to now the initiative at U.N. had been taken by the U.S.S.R. and the Ukraine. There had not as yet been the slightest suggestion that any state, other than Britain, was intervening in Greece. Indeed, as late as August 12, 1946, the then premier, Tsaldaris, told *The Times* that guerilla activities in the north were "a purely internal Greek question on the maintenance of law and order among the Greek population" and that he did not think "that these guerilla activities could be regarded in any way as an issue between Yugoslavia and Greece."

In December, 1946, however, Athens complained to the Security Council that Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia were giving "substantial support" to the guerillas. The cause for this was not any change in the policies of Greece's northern neighbours. It lay elsewhere. American intervention was imminent. But two years ago such open intervention in the affairs of another Allied country was not as easy to put across as now. A pretext had to be found. Hence, on American instructions, Tsaldaris put his complaint to the United Nations, leaving the British and U.S. Governments to do the rest.

The Soviet Union, as before, stubbornly fought for the thesis that the whole trouble in Greece arose from the fascist restoration and British intervention. The U.S.A. and Britain, on the other hand, as stubbornly defended Athens. It was finally decided to send to Greece a Commission of Investigation. This Commission was appointed by the Security Council on December 19, 1946, and reported back on May 23, 1947. It consisted of Australia, Belgium, Brazil, China, Colombia, France, Poland, Syria, the United Kingdom, the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.

When the Commission first started work in Greece there were some indications that the U.S. delegates were relatively objective. But in March the "Truman doctrine" was enunciated, after which observers in Greece noted that the American delegates' attitude visibly altered. When a team of the Commission was to have met General Markos, only the Soviet and Polish delegates kept the appointment.

On the key question of alleged foreign aid to the Greek guerillas the Commission was sharply divided. Out of eleven, only six voted

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the conclusion that Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia were guilty, and these included Britain and the U.S.A., both committed up to the hilt on the side of Athens. China, too, could hardly vote otherwise, having at home a situation analogous to that of Greece.

On the other side were the U.S.S.R. and Poland, with a well-documented minority report showing the real cause of Greece's difficulties. And France, Belgium and Colombia, all agreed, up to May 14, 1947, that the conditions of the enquiry did not make a judicial conclusion possible. However, for reasons yet to be explained, the Belgians and Colombians at the last moment altered their formulation, simply stating that it was not the job of the Commission to allot the blame. Excluding the interested parties there was thus no majority against Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia on the Security Council Commission. An examination of the "evidence" shows why. In the case of Albania alone, for example, of 14 witnesses presented by Athens, ten contradicted their own testimony under cross-examination; of these, two admitted that their first testimony was forced out of them by the police, two were shown to be individuals of known bad character, and another a war criminal. Yet on such " evidence " Albania was found guilty by the majority.

If the Security Council could not agree before, it certainly could not do so now. So the matter was placed before the Assembly in October, 1947. The Americans first tried to include in the resolution a reference to the guilt of Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, but in face of Vyshinsky's opposition quickly withdrew this. The Assembly then decided to send a Special Committee to Greece. The U.S.S.R. and Poland refused to participate in this new Committee, in view of the clear use of the Assembly to give rubber-stamp approval to Anglo-American policy. Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia also refused all further co-operation.

The Assembly's Committee consisted of Australia, Brazil, China, France, Mexico, the Netherlands, Pakistan, the United Kingdom and the U.S.A. But even this committee could not dragoon everybody into support of its conclusions. In the final report (issued this August though dated June), the Australians contracted out in the following words:

> The Australian delegation as a rule abstained from . . . "conclusions" . . . which were not based on the direct observations of observers. In its opinion it was as unnecessary as it was inadvisable to draw categorical conclusions either from the presumptions of observers who had no access to three of the four countries concerned or from the evidence of witnesses produced by only one of the four interested Governments."

Of these same witnesses the Report itself writes:

> The majority were presented by the Greek Liaison Service and were for the most part examined in the presence of a Greek liaison officer. Most of the first-hand (*sic*) evidence relating to material aid given to the Greek guerillas by the northern neighbours of Greece was given by surrendered or captured guerillas under detention by the Greek authorities.

Anyone knowing anything of Greek police methods will assess just how reliable is such " evidence".

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Stripped of such "evidence", stripped of mere "presumptions", the Report reveals the fact that in six whole months the U.N. observers "saw" one guerilla cross the Albanian frontier, thirteen cross the Yugoslav frontier, and a platoon of Athens troops on one occasion and 75 "unidentified men" on another occasion cross the Bulgarian frontier. Twice they saw footmarks across the frontier which "confirmed" stories of witnesses (they do not say how they identified guerilla footmarks as against monarchist footmarks). Twice they claim to have seen machine gun fire from Albania and twice from Yugoslavia (one of the cases being that of a machine gun sited 30 metres inside Yugoslavia observed from 2,000 metres). One observers' group claims to have been fired on from 300 metres within Yugoslavia. This is the sum total of direct evidence collected during six months of observation at a cost to the United Nations of more than $700,000.

On no occasion did the observers see arms being conveyed into Greece for the guerillas, though they saw Athens troops bring supplies across the frontier from Bulgaria "evidently" lodged in Bulgaria by the guerillas. They did not find any ammunition identifiable as coming from Greece's northern neighbours. And, despite the Foreign Office and State Department protests before the full report was published, they do not record a single verifiable case of a Greek child having being sent abroad against its parents' wishes.

That is the essence of the case to be presented to this autumn's Assembly. The evidence demonstrates that there is no case for the allegation that the governments of Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia are aiding the Greek guerillas. But the Report is peppered with nice quotable passages which Athens, London and Washington have already used to the utmost which suggest, contrary to the recorded evidence, that a case has been made.

The Anglo-American-dominated Assembly will, by majority vote, continue to cloak the crimes of Anglo-American imperialism in Greece. Attempts are already being made to concentrate the fire against Albania, regarded as the "weakest link" on Greece's northern frontier. The capitalist press will give the widest publicity to the most fantastic allegations of arming the guerillas and abducting children. But the cloak is not without holes. The voice of the Soviet Union, of Poland, and other progressive voices will be heard on the floor of the Assembly. It is important that these voices are heard as widely as possible. For the Assembly of the United Nations can only be a cloak for the imperialists in so far as the voice of progress finding expression there, is not transmitted to the world's peoples.

A stencilled Discussion Guide (3s a year post free) is available on the fifteenth of each month, to assist leaders of LABOUR MONTHLY *Discussion Groups to organise a fruitful discussion of the issues raised in the current issue. Questions are posed for discussion and suggestions for further reading. The Guide, however, must be ordered in advance, and should not be confused with the pamphlet "Organised Discussion" (2d) which gives hints on the formation of Discussion Groups.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WAR IN SOUTH-EAST ASIA

By LI-HUANG

WITH the British Labour Government's colonial war against the Malayan people, war or partial war, is now being waged in practically every country of South-East Asia. Imperialist interests, led by the U.S.A. with Britain as junior partner, have in recent months started new offensive campaigns against the colonial peoples in certain "key" areas.

In Malaya, the imperialists' offensive culminated in June, when they banned the Pan-Malayan Federation of Trade Unions, the Communist Party of Malaya, the New Democratic Youth League and other democratic organisations, carried out mass arrests, passed the Emergency Regulations and launched a barbarous colonial war. Weapons, from Spitfires, Beaufighters and rockets to "head-hunting knives, decorated with tufts of human hair" and troops, from Guards—the élite of the Army—to Borneo Dyaks—head-hunters—are now used to kill the Malayan democrats, who fought side by side with British lads against Japanese Fascism in the bitter years of 1942-45, and whose representatives marched abreast with British soldiers in the Victory Parade.

In India, the Nehru Government launched a large-scale police offensive against the working-class movement, the Indian Communist Party and the trade union, peasant and student organisations; and arrested more than 1,000 people, including many prominent working-class leaders. In Indonesia, the people's liberation movement suffered temporary setback after the American imperialists succeeded in concocting the pro-American Hatta cabinet which signed the humiliating "Renville Agreement" in January of this year: and now the Dutch imperialists, under cover of the "negotiation" conducted by the American-monopolised Good Offices Commission of the United Nations, are preparing for a new offensive on the Indonesian people. In Siam, the fascist government of Pibul Songram closed more than 500 overseas Chinese schools and, working hand in glove with British and American imperialism and with Chiang Kai-shek's secret service agents in Bangkok, carried out mass arrests of Chinese democrats on June 15 and August 12 under the pretexts of arresting "secret society gangsters". In Burma, British imperialists and Indian reactionaries are now directly helping the Thakin Nu Government to fight the Burmese people's movement.

Why do the imperialists start such an offensive against the colonial and dependent peoples in South-East Asia at this particular moment? The reasons must be found in the present situation in Asia as a whole and in China in particular. The strength of the colonial peoples in Asia has grown tremendously after the Second World War. Through years of hard struggles against Fascism they have greatly raised their political consciousness and are well determined to get rid

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the imperialist rule, no matter whether it is the same " old look " or a " new look " which in fact continues to enslave them. This has been demonstrated by the failure of the French and Dutch imperialists to defeat the liberation movements of Viet Nam and Indonesia; by the solid united front opposition to the phoney Constitution in Malaya; by the failure of the fake " independence " to deceive the Burmese and Indian peoples.

But the most important factor is the spectacular success of the Chinese people's liberation movement which has completely upset the imperialist calculations and has shaken the foundations of their rule in Asia. The liberation of more than one-third of China's population and nearly one-half of her key areas; the wiping out of 2,641,000 Kuomintang troops in two years and passing to the strategic offensive of the People's Army on every civil war front; the impending collapse of the Chiang Kai-shek régime and the inevitable final victory of the Chinese people in the whole of China—all these have completely upset the American imperialist plans of using China's enormous manpower and resources and her strategic bases against the Soviet Union in a new war. They further signify that the birth of a free, democratic New China is not far off, that the feudal system and imperialist exploitation, which have already been eliminated in one-quarter of China, will soon be eliminated throughout China once and for all. Such outstanding achievements of the Chinese people will have great effect on the whole world situation and first of all will tremendously strengthen the people's movements throughout Asia.

While the American imperialists are busily exerting their efforts to find any way to "save" the tottering Chiang Kai-shek régime and to check the victorious advance of the Chinese people on the one hand, they are at pains to resort to a new strategy on the other. This was revealed by Walter Lippmann, the influential American correspondent, who wrote in the *New York Herald Tribune* (Paris edition) on June 22, 1948:

> . . . the maintenance of Western influence in Asia will call for a policy of choosing key areas, holding them strongly and developing them intensively and progressively . . . For it seems exceedingly unlikely that the whole of Asia can be subsidised under a larger Marshall plan, or supported by intervention under the Truman doctrine . . . or that much can be salvaged from the West if it does not concentrate its energies at a few selected points from which its influence and example can be made to radiate.

In a joint Chiefs-of-Staff Conference recently held in Washington, according to a Telepress correspondent, plans for " strategic re-orientation " of British and American policies in South-East Asia and the Pacific to meet the expected collapse of the Kuomintang régime in China were discussed. Decisions were taken to organise as soon as possible a " cordon sanitaire " in the south Pacific and South-East Asia against the Asian democratic movement and simultaneously to " restore law and order " in Indonesia, Malaya, Burma and French Indo-China.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British policy towards China is now rapidly changing. A new reactionary line-up between U.S.A., Britain and Chiang Kai-shek against the Chinese liberation movement is now being formed. In the past three years, Britain has maintained a policy of "neutrality" towards China's internal affairs. Because of this "neutrality", the British colony of Hong Kong has to a certain extent become a refuge for Chinese democrats who escaped Kuomintang police terror there. After Japan's surrender, British imperialist interests were almost completely squeezed out of China by American imperialist interests and the Kuomintang government, while subservient to America, maintained an anti-British policy. In the face of the victorious advance of the Chinese people, Britain's "neutral" attitude rapidly disappears. British and American imperialism and Chiang Kai-shek find that they are now menaced by a powerful common enemy whom they must jointly deal with and consequently their contradictions have become a secondary issue.

In a recent conference of British Governors in South-East Asia, held in Singapore, Sir Alexander Grantham, Governor of Hong Kong, said that the Communist guerilla movement in South China was a potential menace to Britain in South-East Asia. Answering a question from Mr. Rankin, M.P., in the House of Commons, on July 7, Mr. Creech Jones, Secretary of State for the Colonies, said:

> It is true that you see in Malaya today a conflict which is not unlike the conflict which is going on in China. It would appear that the same kind of interests are involved as in China itself.

Before answering this question, when he was discussing the situation in Malaya he said:

> I would say emphatically that we have not here at all the emergence of a nationalist movement which Britain is engaged in putting down. This is not a movement of the people in Malaya. It is the conduct of gangsters who are out to destroy the very foundations of human society—orderly life.

Hence when Mr. Creech Jones slandered the Malayan People's movement, he slandered the Chinese people's liberation movement at the same time. This was the first time since Japan's surrender that a Minister and an important government official—the Governor of Hong Kong, which has a very close relation with the situation in China—openly expressed the British Government's opinion towards China.

There have already been many events showing that the British Governments in Hong Kong and in other parts of South-East Asia are now in close co-operation with the Chiang Kai-shek government and America. T. V. Soong, the Kuomintang Governor of Kwantung, who visited Hong Kong many times since he took office last year, has frequently asked the Hong Kong Government to suppress the democratic movement in the colony. His requests were not without results. Leaders of Chinese democratic parties and popular organisations have repeatedly been warned by the Hong Kong Special Branch and other government authorities not to do anything which

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would "harm the friendship between Britain and a friendly nation". Progressive papers have been warned not to publish anything which would "insult the leaders of a friendly nation". New regulations with the aim of restricting Trades Union activities; new immigration regulations which stop Chinese coming to Hong Kong from anywhere (except from China) unless they carry Kuomintang government's passports, have been passed. Malcolm MacDonald, Commissioner-General for South-East Asia, has recently visited Nanking to discuss the Malayan situation with the Kuomintang government. A conference of "Joint Police Defence" between Hong Kong, Canton (Kuomintang's main base in South China) and Macao (Portuguese colony near Hong Kong) has recently been held. There is now much speculation in Hong Kong about what the Government would do to the "Chinese dissidents" who are now there as political refugees.

Shortly before the June mass arrests of Chinese democrats in Bangkok, British officials and Kuomintang secret police chiefs conferred secretly with the Siamese police authorities and confirmed the names in the black list prepared by the Kuomintang agents. British officials also requested the Siamese authorities to supply information on "Communist activities". In June, U.S.A. diplomats in South-East Asia held a conference in Bangkok and representatives from the State Department were also present. Mass arrests of overseas Chinese in Viet Nam and deportation of Chinese democrats in Indonesia by the French and Dutch authorities also took place.

Such a new reactionary line-up had in fact been admitted by Mr. Creech Jones when he spoke on British Colonial Policy at Caxton Hall on June 18. He stated that mutual understanding and co-operation had been achieved among Britain, France, Portugal, Belgium, Holland and America for the full development of the resources of their colonial territories.

It is now 1948, not 1927. The tragic events of 1927 in China will not be repeated. In these twenty-one years, the Chinese people are grown manifoldly stronger through bitter struggle and with enormous sacrifice. They are now under a politically mature leadership. For the first time in their history, they are stronger than the reactionary forces and their final victory is not far off. Since neither American dollars, guns nor even troops can check their advance, what can British imperialism, a junior partner of Wall Street, hope to do? What it will certainly achieve, if unchecked, is to harm the friendship between the two great nations—Britain and China—who were Allies in the common fight against Fascism. It is the duty of the people in this country to see that such British imperialist plans be defeated.

Other articles on the Colonial Question which have appeared in 1948 *include*:

"Foreign Imperialism in Indonesia," by Neil Stewart (Feb.).
"Ground Nuts To You!" by Ivor Montagu (May).
"Whither India?" by R. Palme Dutt (June).
"A Garhwali Hero Speaks" (July).
"War Comes to Malaya," by H. B. Lim (August).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REAPPEARANCE OF THE NEW RHENISH GAZETTE

On 26th September "a state of siege" in Cologne had been proclaimed and Marx's paper was immediately banned from publication. On 12th October, when it reappeared, a well-known revolutionary poet had joined its board, as is shown by the notice: "As a result of the support which has been shown especially in Cologne, for maintaining the Neue Rhenish Zeitung, it has been possible to overcome the financial difficulties following on the state of siege and once more to reappear. The Editorial Committee is as before with the addition of Ferdinand Freiligrath. Karl Marx, Editor-in-Chief."

In Mid-October, Marx, at the urgent request of the members, took over the direct leadership of the Cologne Workers' Union.

REVOLUTION IN VIENNA

Neue Rheinische Zeitung, October 12, 1848.

In its first issue (on June 1st) the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* had to report a revolution (that of May 25) from Vienna. Today, on our first re-appearance after the interruption due to the state of siege in Cologne, we publish the news of the incomparably more important Vienna revolution of October 6 and 7. The detailed reports on the Vienna events compel us to omit today all argumentative articles. Hence only a few words, and those on the Vienna revolution. Our readers will see from the reports of the Vienna correspondents that this revolution threatens, if not to suffer failure, at least to be hamstrung in its development by the bourgeoisie's mistrust of the working class. However that may be, its repercussion on Hungary, Italy and Germany brings to naught the whole plan of campaign of the counter-revolution. The flight of the Emperor and the Czech deputies from Vienna forces the Vienna bourgeoisie, unless it wants to beg for mercy, to continue the struggle.

The Frankfurt Assembly, which is employed just now in presenting us Germans with a national jail and a common lash, has been unpleasantly shocked out of its reveries, and the Berlin Ministry does not know what to make of the universal panacea, the *state of siege*.

Like revolution, the state of siege has made a tour of the world. The attempt has even been made to apply the experiment on a grand scale, to a whole kingdom, to Hungary. The state of siege will never be able to recover from this rebuff. The state of siege has become forever compromised. It is an irony of fate that, together with Jellachich, the Western hero of the state of siege—Cavaignac—has become the target of attack of all the fractions which he rescued with grapeshot in June. Only by decisively going over to the revolution can make himself possible for a little while yet.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MANIFESTO OF WROCLAW CONGRESS

The World Congress of Intellectuals in Defence of Peace, with nearly 500 delegates from 45 different countries, met in Wroclaw, Poland, August 25 to 28, and issued a manifesto. Out of 42 British delegates, 35 voted for the manifesto, 4 against, and 3 abstained. Out of 32 U.S.A. delegates, 23 voted for, 7 against and 2 abstained. One delegate from Brazil abstained. Other delegations were unanimously for the Manifesto.

We, workers in culture, science and the arts, who have gathered in the Polish town of Wroclaw from 45 countries, address the intellectuals of the world. We remind you of the mortal danger which only recently confronted the culture of mankind. We have witnessed Fascist barbarity —the destruction of historical and cultural values, the persecution and death of brain workers, the utter disregard for all spiritual values—which endangered the very concepts of conscience, reason and progress.

EUROPEAN CULTURE IN DANGER

Human culture was saved by the supreme exertion of all the democratic forces—the Soviet Union, the peoples of Great Britain and the United States, by the heroic popular resistance in countries seized by Fascism—at the cost of unparalleled sacrifices and privations. And yet, contrary to the will and aspirations of the peoples of all countries, a handful of selfish men in America and Europe, who inherited from Fascism its ideas of racial superiority and the negation of progress, who took over its tendency to settle all problems by force of arms, are again making an attempt against the spiritual wealth of the nations of the world.

The culture of the European countries, which have made an enormous contribution to the treasury of humanity, stands in danger of loss of its national features. In a number of countries — Spain, Greece, Latin-America—forces hostile to progress not only preserve, but create, new hotbeds of Fascism.

Contrary to reason and conscience, oppression of human beings and of whole nations which the oppressors style as coloured continues and even increases. The people who borrowed the methods of Fascism practise racial discrimination within their countries and persecute progressive workers in science and the arts. Scientific discoveries which might benefit humanity are used for secret production of means of destruction, which tends to discredit and distort the lofty mission of science.

Under the rule of these people, the human word and art are not used for purposes of educating and bringing peoples together, but for fanning base man-hating passions and for preparing war. Firmly believing in the need for free development and dissemination of the achievements of progressive culture in the name of peace, progress and the future of mankind, we protest against any restriction of this freedom and stress the need for mutual understanding among cultures and peoples in the interests of world civilisation.

PROTEST AGAINST USING SCIENCE FOR DESTRUCTION

Realising that modern science has released great new forces, which will inevitably be used by humanity either for its good or to its detriment, Congress protests against the utilisation of science for the purpose of destruction and calls on the peoples to bend all

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their efforts towards disseminating knowledge widely throughout the world, towards the application of science in order to reduce, as swiftly as possible, the poverty, ignorance, disease and want affecting the majority of mankind, and also to assist in relaxing restrictions on the free movement of those who serve the cause of peace and progress, on the free publication and circulation of books, on the publication of the results of scientific research as well as of all scientific and cultural achievements which serve the same aims.

The nations of the world do not wish war and possess sufficient strength to defend peace and culture against the attempts of the new Fascism. Intellectuals of the world! You are facing a great responsibility to your nations, to humanity and history. We raise our voices for peace, for the free cultural progress of the nations, for their national independence and close co-operation. We call upon all brain workers in every country to discuss our proposals. We call for national Congresses of intellectuals in defence of peace to be held in all countries. We call for national committees in defence of peace to be set up everywhere. We call for international connections of intellectuals of all countries to be strengthened in the interests of peace.

Book Reviews

Malaya

The Chinese in Malaya by Victor Purcell (Oxford University Press, 18*s*).

DR. PURCELL has chosen a popular subject, from the interest point of view. In this sense, the book is a success. In other respects, the book is an important failure: a failure because it seeks to reduce the 2,380,000 Chinese in Malaya into a political problem without showing why or how; important because Dr. Purcell writes as an apologist for the Colonial Office. Thus his "cold objectivity" is merely formal and misleading; the historical data he has unearthed and embellished are mainly from old, heavily biased official records; thus he arches his back with dutiful precision whenever he encounters a Communist or thinks he has encountered one.

Approaching his subject from this standpoint, Dr. Purcell soon finds himself metamorphosing from a fairly well-equipped chronicler into an ungainly bundle of contradictions. Thus, he admits the splendid service of the Chinese in the war against Japan, the leading role of the Communists in the Resistance movement, and the telling fact that "the (Japanese) conquering army was obsessed with fear and hatred of the Communists". He admits the terrible sacrifices which these brave Malayans made in the anti-Fascist struggle—40,000 Communists and sympathisers being killed outright in the four-day purge. In a fit of candour he also records "the respect and affection with which the country population regarded many of the guerillas" (the Malayan People's Anti-Japanese Army)—this, despite the fact that "the Japanese tried to make people believe that all the guerillas were mere bands of terrorists and gang-robbers".

But the fit is soon over. Dr. Purcell resumes his normal functions as an Official propagandist. The British Colonial administration returned, after the country had been liberated. The Communist Party, the MPAJA, the General Labour Union (later the Pan-Malayan Federation of Trade Unions), the Women's Federation and other organisations which had the audacity to take the democratic ideals of the United Nations Charter seriously became the target of Government purge and slander. The British Government, too, "tried to make the people believe that the guerillas were mere bands of terrorists and gang-robbers" and that the post-war progress towards national liberation was a horror second only to the Kremlin itself. Dr. Purcell justifies the shootings, killing and deportation of democrats with an enthusiasm which shows his tough

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bureaucratic fibre. Even the February 15th incident (1946) which resulted in the slaughter of 15 persons in Labis and two in Singapore fails to evoke a shred of remorse in the author. Would Lim Ah Liang's death resulting from his prison sentence have made any difference to the author's assessment of his "crime" of demanding freedom of speech? One doubts it: it would not be convenient for the Colonial Office or for Dr. Purcell to regret its misdeeds—especially now that these misdeeds have been formally incorporated into the Labour Government's Colonial policy.

The Communists are also "blamed" for the rise of nationalism among the Malays under the leadership of the Malay Nationalist Party. No credit is given to the progressive Malays for showing their disgust at the imperialist policy of Britain by the formation of a political party. Instead, they are officially condemned for the unpardonable crime of being approved by the Left and for daring to show their sympathy for the Indonesians.

The apparently irrelevant mention of Malay politics in a book on the Chinese is worthy of note and well worth a smile. For herein lie the hidden springs of the imperialist intrigue to set the Chinese against the Malays. What is the effect? None, in Malaya itself, where the main parties—the Malay Nationalist Party, the Malayan Indian Congress, the Communist Party, the Malayan Democratic Union, and the Youth organisations—have independently and staunchly advocated national unity; but considerable in the United Kingdom, where official handouts on the Colonies are still regarded by the majority of the Press and by the B.B.C. as either sacrosanct or at least as plausible tales. The crudities of Mr. Bevin, Mr. Eden and their retinue in the House of Commons debate on Malaya show to what extent the Government is prepared to gamble on the ignorance of the British public.

What are the prospects of the Chinese in Malaya? The democratic forces have emphatically given their answer, namely, freedom and democracy through unified effort of the Malayan people themselves—Malays, Indian, Chinese, Eurasians. Dr. Purcell, on the other hand, merely repeats the meaningless Colonial Office version of Citizenship which carries no votes, no freedom of organisation, not even the structural imitations of self-government. And (alas for the advocates of benign despotism!) the bombing and mass arrests of trade unionists and other democrats—Chinese and non-Chinese—are now in full swing as part of the Official scheme to impose the new Citizenship.

H. B. LIM.

Cole on Steel

"Why Nationalise Steel?" by G. D. H. Cole (*New Statesman* pamphlet, 2s).

COLE here presents in a handy form the case for steel nationalisation: its pre-war inefficiency; the abuse of its monopoly in restricting the industry's capacity, with particular reference to its much-vaunted but totally inadequate post-war plan; and especially the dominating political power which rests in those who control this basic industry, a power which is available as the last bulwark of reactionary capitalism. The author has clearly been greatly helped by Owen's "Steel" (Lawrence & Wishart—now reduced to 2s 6d) whose arguments he follows closely. He rightly stresses that the economic case against capitalist control must be based not primarily on its pre-war record but on its post-war behaviour and plans. The Federation's tactic is to admit pre-war errors but to say "Look how well we are doing now, look at our grandiose plans for the future—and leave us alone." Cole, like Owen, boldly faces this argument and has no difficulty in demolishing it; it is a pity that he did not spend more space in analysing the fallacy of the Federation's present production claims rather than limiting himself almost entirely to the arguments Owen used two years ago.

It is when he turns to the technique of nationalisation that Cole shows signs of woolliness, almost of panic. The problem of definition, of what sections to take over and what to leave out, of exceeding the Govern-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment's mandate, cause him considerable concern. His conclusion is to take over the ore mines, pig iron and ingot steel production, and semi-finished production, but to take over finished production only where it is technically integrated with the earlier stages. But it really does not matter exactly where the line is drawn; there is infinite scope for dispute whenever one sets out to produce an exact definition of an industry. What is important is that the line be drawn somewhere and that the Government gets on with the job.

I. A. S.

Shorter Notices

United Nations: Second Assembly, New York. Issued by U.N.A. (Bernard Moore, 2*s* 6*d*, 110 pp.).

THE purpose of the United Nations Association of Great Britain, laid down in its Constitution, is to foster among the people of this country a sense of loyalty "to the international community" and to secure the acceptance and support by the British people of the United Nations.

The practice of the Association is to support the line of the British Government within the United Nations and to attack the actions of the Soviet Government within the United Nations. This is well illustrated by the Report published by the Association of the Second General Assembly of the United Nations. The tone is set in the preface: ". . . Time and again the Political Committee, the most spectacular committee of the Assembly, was treated to violent harangues reminiscent more of the Marble Arch than the seat of the United Nations. Delegates listened aghast as their colleagues from Russia, Yugoslavia, the Ukraine, Byelorussia, and Poland seemed deliberately to be provoking them by tirades of abuse, attacks on alleged American imperialism . . ."

What follows is not an objective report of the proceedings of the Assembly, providing material from which the reader might draw his own deductions, but a biased and perverted report aimed at securing support for the writer's own opinions. We are entitled to expect something better than this from the United Nations Association.

STANLEY EVANS.

The German Revolution of 1848, by Roy Pascal (Fore Publications, 1*s* 6*d*).

THIS little booklet gives an interesting survey and analysis of the main events of Germany's miscarried democratic revolution. Following in the main line the analysis of Marx's and Engels' "Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany", Professor Pascal shows how the weakness, cowardliness and also the nationalistic consent of the Liberal bourgeois ruined the chances of a democratic victory. The quotations which illustrate the narrow-minded attitude of the German bourgeoisie towards other oppressed nations are of special interest in the light of the experience of a century of reactionary developments in Germany.

J. W.

Trade unionists who may be delegates to conferences or preparing annual reports should note these articles on wages and workshop issues in LABOUR MONTHLY *in* 1948:

"Deflation and the Economic Crisis," by Maurice Dobb (Jan.).
"Trade Unions and Communism," by Arthur Horner (Feb.); also as a 3d. pamphlet.
"The Offensive Against Labour Unity," by Harry Adams (April).
"Guns or Butter," by J. R. Campbell (May).
"Strings or Chains?" by D. N. Pritt, K.C., M.P. (June).
"Caste System in Britain," by P. H. H. Bryan (June).
"Two Impressions of Scarborough," by Steve Lawther and Tom Gittins (July).
"The Wage Freeze," by Jim Gardner (July).
"Britain's Economic Plight," by J. R. Campbell (August).
"Trade Union Education," by Douglas Garman (August).

Some are still available; but to ensure not missing such important contributions, readers should order regularly through newsagents or take out subscriptions (1*s. yearly,* 13*s. overseas*); *post free from* 134 *Ballards Lane, London, N.*3.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is a Good Time to Become Acquainted with

MASSES & MAINSTREAM

America's only Progressive Cultural Monthly.

THE OCTOBER ISSUE

Let the Rail Splitter Awake (a poem) ..... *Pablo Neruda*

America's New Party ..... *Adam Lapin*

The Metropolitan Opera Farce ..... *Sidney Finklestien*

Journey to Wales ..... *Thomas McGrath*

Current Theories on Anti-Semitism...*Morris U. Schappes*

Subscription $4.50

Write,

Masses & Mainstream, 832 Broadway, New York 3, New York.

Canada's Only Marxist Magazine

NATIONAL AFFAIRS MONTHLY

Publishers: National Committee of the Labor-Progressive Party.

SEPTEMBER ISSUE contains important articles by leading Canadian Marxists:

TIM BUCK, National Leader of the Labor - Progressive Party: Twenty Answers to New Liberty. J. B. SALSBERG: The Basic Issues facing the 1948 Labor Conventions. MAURICE RUSH, Provincial Organiser: Current Political Trends in British Columbia.

For each subscription commencing with September issue two free copies for June and August, 1948, will be given.

Yearly subscription rate: $2.00 through Progress Books, 95 King Street East, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

NOTES FROM THE GALLOWS

By JULIUS FUCHIK

The day-to-day diary of the Editor of Rude Pravo and leader of the Czech Communist Party during his imprisonment and torture by the Gestapo.

4/- By post **4/3**

SALVATION WITHOUT SAVIOURS

or The Rout of the Divinities.

By W. H. PARKE

A simple and thought-provoking book on religion and politics.

2/6 By post **2/10**

From your bookshop or from

CENTRAL BOOKS, LTD.

2 Parton St., LONDON, W.C.1.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Brave". The letters which we published from American readers in July under the title "Behind the Dollar Curtain" startled British readers; some wrote to ask for more. Space is limited, but this is typical:

"Cleveland has a strong liberal tradition, yet friends who are politically to the Left dare not talk freely on the telephone. If you assisted the Spanish Loyalist cause by a contribution or by attending a meeting here during the Civil War, you might be asked to explain if you are foreign-born. This has already happened. Meanwhile prices for essential commodities rise to high heaven and the impending crash moves ever near." ("Reader", Cleveland).

THE BIG SQUEEZE

Next door, in Canada, they are feeling the pinch, too. "The British are not the only ones who are being squeezed by the American exchange and inflation", writes a woman reader from Toronto. "We, too, are suffering, especially those who work for a set wage. It is becoming increasingly difficult even to provide food for the family at prevailing prices."

INTERNATIONAL FOCUS

Yes, the international character of the magazine comes out in letter after letter. Two different angles:

"The June issue was a beaut. Mr. Dutt's article on what's happening in India told me a great deal that the American press has been silent on, and Mr. Pritt's analysis of what the Marshall Plan really means was a gem."

J. S. (California).

"I realise more and more what a tremendous role the L.M. must of necessity play as a leader of the British people still within a rapidly decaying empire system."

C. W. (Manitoba).

OUR FAVOURITE

In spite of holidays, the development fund has been doing well. Among the letters enclosing donations every month, it is difficult to pick a favourite. But perhaps the one which gave us most pleasure this month was from a woman reader in Yorkshire. After saying that she felt "the announcement of so many appreciations of your work arriving from all parts of the world through your letter box has made me realise that mine is long overdue", she writes in warmest terms, describing how she and her sister had found L.M. in the public library many years ago, and how much it has meant to them since. With it came a postal order for 5s, "which isn't much but it's all I can do. We have a sister who has been in hospital for six years, and as it is a distance away, it is a drain on our resources. But our first loyalty is to her, as you will understand. It is just tough luck. But the worst of it is hers. I do hope you have better luck economically with others." Because that 5/-, we know, meant a lot to her, it means a lot to us, too. The total during August was

£45 : 4s. : 4d.

and came from

Director, £2; E. D. McCallum, 5s.; Cambridge C.P., 10s.; R. McLeod, 5s.; L. Rowan, 6s.; L'Humanite, 2s.; R.F.B., £3; W. Lakin-Smith, 2s. 6d.; H. N. Humphreys, 3s. 6d.; H.S.M., 2s. 6d.; D. M. Clarke, 10s.; Cambridge C.P., 10s.; Anon., Whitchurch, 1s.; S. Morrissy, 10s.; Mrs. K. Kennedy, 2s. 6d.; T. Flood, 2s. 6d.; D. Rees, 10s.; Olivia Greene, £2; R. McLeod, 5s.; D. J. Davis, 2s.; Royston Green, 3s. 6d.; S. Mill, 10s.; F. Renouf, 5s.; E. D. McCallum, 5s.; P. N. Brinson, £1 10s.; Socialist Sailor, £1; J. A. Purton, 7s. 6d.

Other contributions include:—

T.C., Socialist Society, 2s. 6d.; J.S., 10s.; H. E. Reisz, 8s.; Mrs. M. Darby, 3s.; Mrs. B.W., 10s.; P. Maughan, 18s.; Mrs. E. Whelen, 8s.; H.G.K., 4s.; M. R. Turner, 8s.; H. Dasch, 3s.; L. Brooks, 1s. 6d.; J. Rattray, £1; C.M.F., £1 10s.; R. G. Weighton, £1 7s.; J.T.M.G., 7s. W. H. Laithwaite, £2 1s.; R. Ely, 1s.; W. Lynn, 8s.; Mrs. V. S. Truelove, 3s.; E. Sutcliffe, 5s.; A. W. Pearce, 8s.; Exeter Reader, £5; R.L.R., £1 8s.; W.S.W., 8s.; S.P.C. (Cyprus), 2s.; E. Williams, 3s.; J.D., 8s.; L. J. Martin, 8s.; Mrs. R. Barrett, 10s.; G. Thomas, 5s.; R.B., 8s.; Anon., Gloucester, 5s.; C. Nettleton, 8s.; S.M. (U.S.A.), 14s. 3d.; M.H. (U.S.A.), £1 3s. 8d.; R.B. (U.S.A.), £4 17s.; from a Doctor, £2.

Our thanks to you all. ANGELA TUCKETT.

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Dorchester and District Newspapers, Ltd. (T.U.), Dorchester, Great Britain

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED